THE REMONSTRANCE
AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

BOSTON, JANUARY, 1917

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Nebraska, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Connecticut, Maryland, New Hampshire, Vermont, New Jersey, South Dakota, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Ohio, Virginia and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers for one year can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,
Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other publications of the Association may be obtained from the Secretary, Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts

One hundred and forty-one Branch Committees; 39,573 members in 443 cities, towns, and villages*

MRS. JOHN BALCH, President.
MRS. GEORGE R. AGASSIZ
MRS. ROBERT S. BRADLEY
MISS ANNA L. DAWES
MRS. CHARLES E. GUILD
MRS. CURTIS GUILD
MRS. FRANCIS C. LOWELL
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY
Vice-Presidents
MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer
Walnut Street, Brookline

Education and Organization Committee
Chairman
MRS. WM. LOWELL PUTNAM

Publicity Committee
Chairman
MRS. HENRY PRESTON WHITE

Membership Committee
Chairman
MISS JULIA C. PRENDERGAST

Public Interests League
President
MRS. B. L. ROBINSON
Recording Secretary
MRS. RANDOLPH FROTHINGHAM
Corresponding Secretary
MRS. STEPHEN S. FITZGERALD

** Net present membership of women over 21 years of age; eliminating those names which the Association has lost from deaths, resignations, and removals from the State*

MEMBERS ARE EARNESTLY REQUESTED TO KEEP HEADQUARTERS ADVISED OF CHANGES OF ADDRESS.

TWO MORE VICTORIES

ANTI-SUFFRAGISTS everywhere may well rejoice over the victories for their cause in South Dakota and West Virginia. They are the more noteworthy because it happened, in both states, that the opening of the campaign found the anti-suffragists imperfectly organized. But they arose splendidly to the emergency, and the conservative elements in the electorate rallied to their support.

In both states, the suffragists were confident of success. They poured in money, literature and speakers. They secured the endorsement of many social, political and philanthropic organizations. They beguiled a large part of the press into thinking that they stood for a great popular movement. They followed their familiar methods of disturbing anti-suffrage meetings and heckling anti-suffrage speakers. They revived the long-ago refuted slanders of a connection between the liquor interests and the anti-suffrage cause. But their misrepresentations and calumnies did not avail them. Apparently, they reacted against them, and made their defeat more decisive.

So long ago as April, 1914, THE REMONSTRANCE said:

"The suffrage movement has not gained a foot of territory through the vote of the male electorate, east of the Mississippi River. Not one of the New England states, not one of the Middle states, not one of the Southern states, not one of the Middle Western states has given full suffrage to women."

Since that statement was made, the suffragists have appealed to the electorates at fourteen state elections; but the statement remains as true today as when it was first made. The only gains which the suffragists have made in that period are in Montana and Nevada, the combined population of which is only two-thirds as large as that of the city of Boston.

THE COLLAPSE OF THE "WOMAN'S PARTY"

MANY uncertainties followed the Presidential election and the count of the vote in the doubtful states.

But one fact was certain from the day after the election; and that was that the campaign of the so-called "Woman's Party" in the suffrage states had been a complete and gloomy failure.

The "Woman's Party," alias the Congressional Union, sent its campaigners into all of the twelve states in which women were to vote for Presidential electors. They carried banners inscribed

WOMEN VOTERS!
Do not send to the White House a man who opposes political freedom for women
VOTE AGAINST PRESIDENT WILSON AND THE DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATES FOR CONGRESS

They held rallies of their own all over the different states. They attended Democratic rallies, and heckled the speakers with demands to know why President Wilson had "kept them out of suffrage." They spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in publicity and in the expenses of their campaigners. Theirs was a noisy, aggressive and truculent campaign, and, up to the day of the election, they declared that they "were bound to win."

And what came of it all? Out of the twelve states in which they waged their war against the President and the Democratic party, *Wilson carried ten: Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Montana, Nevada, Utah, Washington and Wyoming.*

The only states which he did not carry were Illinois and Oregon; and these are states which had been uniformly Republican for a long period of years, with the exception of 1912, when the Progressive split defeated the Republican candidate in every state except Utah and Vermont. For forty years, from 1872 to 1912, Illinois and Oregon voted for the Republican candidates for President, except in 1892, when Illinois went Democratic and the Oregon vote was split. It can scarcely be claimed as a victory for the Woman's Party campaign that they should have adhered to their long-time Republican allegiance at the November election.

It might even be claimed that the antagonism of the Woman's Party proved an asset to the Wilson cause rather than the contrary; for, of the ten suffrage states which chose Wilson electors last November, seven—California, Idaho, Kansas, Montana, Utah, Washington and Wyoming—voted against the Democratic candidates in 1908 and 1904.

It was shown, in the October REMONSTRANCE, that the net result of the Congressional Union crusade in 1914 against the Democratic candidates for Congress in the suffrage states was to increase instead of diminishing the Democratic representation from those states,—the Democrats gaining two Representatives and one Senator. The fact that President Wilson carried seven suffrage states which are normally Republican shows at least that the Woman's Party raid did him no harm. The lesson is one that political leaders in all parties are not likely to forget.

TO REPRESENT OR MISREPRESENT?

The question whether it is the duty of a Representative in Congress to represent or misrepresent his constituents was plainly put to the candidates in the Eighth Massachusetts district on the 26th of October by a meeting at Cambridge of 150 women from all parts of the district, representing the Eighth Congressional District Committee of the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts.

Mr. Frederick S. Deitrick, the Democratic candidate, and Mr. Frederick W. Dallinger, the Republican candidate, met the Committee; and their attention was called by the chairman, Mrs. B. F. Norton of Arlington, to the fact that the voters of the Eighth District, at the election in 1915, had given a majority of 8,735 against suffrage, and they were asked to consider whether it would not be their duty, if elected, whatever their personal views on the question, to vote against the proposed Federal Suffrage Amendment, in accordance with the clearly-expressed desires of their constituents. Both Mr. Deitrick and Mr. Dallinger were personally in favor of suffrage; but Mr. Deitrick replied that he would represent the wishes of his constituents upon the question, and, if elected, would vote against the Federal Amendment, and later, Mr. Dallinger, after mature consideration, expressed the same purpose.

The same consideration should govern the action of every Congressman elected from Massachusetts; for the voters in every district gave, on the average, a two to one majority against the proposed amendment in 1915. There could hardly be a clearer mandate to the Congressmen-elect.

SUFFRAGE AND PROHIBITION

It was an unfortunate coincidence for the suffragists that the voters of South Dakota were called upon to vote on the same day on proposed prohibition and suffrage amendments.

When that happens, a heavy blow is likely to be dealt to the claim that suffrage and prohibition go "hand in hand."

It happened in Ohio in 1914, and Mrs. Harriet Taylor Upton, President of the Ohio Suffrage Association, telegraphing to The Woman's Journal after the election, was obliged to admit: "Drys did not generally vote for us." The official returns disclosed the fact that, out of 88 counties in the state, *58 voted in favor of prohibition and against suffrage;* and suffrage was defeated by a majority of 182,905, while the majority against prohibition was only 84,152.

So, in South Dakota last November, the same voters who adopted the prohibition amendment by a majority of 11,998 defeated woman suffrage by a majority of 4,918. It must have been from the force of habit that The Woman's Journal, in its first issue after the election, declared that it was "the liquor opposition" that defeated suffrage. The liquor interests had their hands full in fighting prohibition, and were unable to defeat it. The only possible explanation of the vote in South Dakota is that thousands of voters who voted for prohibition voted against suffrage, precisely as was the case in Ohio in 1914.

The same inference may fairly be drawn from the vote in West Virginia. In November, 1912, the voters of West Virginia ratified a prohibition amendment by a majority of 92,342. Yet this same electorate, last November, rejected woman suffrage by a majority of 98,067. The Woman's Journal admits that West Virginia was regarded by the suffragists even more hopefully than South Dakota, because of the heavy majority for prohibition in 1912. Yet, as in Ohio and South Dakota, the two causes have been proved to be, not hand in hand but far apart.

The conclusion to which the figures actually point is directly the opposite of that which the suffrage leaders are in the habit of assuming. This was frankly admitted by The New York Evening Post, one of the strongest suffrage newspapers in the country, in an editorial article in its issue of August 17, 1915, in which, after admonishing the suffragists that the business of calling names was bad tactics, it said:

"It would probably be nearer the truth to say that the woman who is against the saloon would also show an inclination against suffrage. The strength of the temperance movement has been among women rather maliciously described as 'home-loving.' That same instinct would militate against any tendency which threatened to take women out of the home by giving them wider political interests."

THE ANTI-SUFFRAGE IDEAL

THE IDEAL OF THE ANTI-SUFFRAGISTS IS THE ULTIMATE UNION OF WOMEN OF ALL CLASSES AND CREEDS ALONG NON-PARTISAN LINES, SO THAT THE INTERESTS OF WOMANHOOD, CHILDHOOD AND CIVILIZATION MAY BE ADVANCED FREE FROM THE STRIFE AND DIVISION OF POLITICS, FACTIONS AND PARTIES; AND THAT THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF PATRIOTISM, MORALITY AND AMERICANISM UPON WHICH ALL GOOD CITIZENS ARE AGREED MAY BE ESTABLISHED MORE FIRMLY IN THE PRESENT AND FUTURE GENERATIONS. — The Woman's Protest.

THE COLLEGE ANTI-SUFFRAGE LEAGUE

The recently-organized College Anti-Suffrage League of Massachusetts Women, to which reference was made in the October REMONSTRANCE, is growing rapidly. At the first League meeting in Boston last November, 90 were present.

On the 16th of November, the League sent Miss Marjorie Dorman, who addressed the Boston meeting, to speak at a meeting at Wellesley, in Billings Hall, under the auspices of the Equal Suffrage League. There were about 150 present. As the Equal Suffrage League is chartered as part of a club for the discussion of suffrage, it is expected that an Anti-Suffrage League will be formed. A group of the girls who heard Miss Dorman expressed a desire to form such a League, after the meeting.

On the 17th of November, Miss Dorman spoke to an audience of more than 100, under the auspices of the Anti-Suffrage Chapter of the Civics Club of Radcliffe. The meeting was very successful. Miss Eleanor Lee, President of the Chapter, presided. On the 8th of December, there was a debate with the Suffrage Chapter of the Club. On the 27th of November, a meeting which had been arranged by Mrs. Lee S. McCollister and Dean Davies of Tufts College, was held at Miner Hall for the young women of Jackson. Mrs. Thomas Allen of Boston, organizing Chairman of the League, addressed the meeting and Mrs. Benjamin L. Robinson of Cambridge answered questions. On the 19th of January, a similar meeting, arranged through the Dean's office, and with the same speakers, is to be held at Mt. Holyoke College; and arrangements are being made for a meeting at Smith College, through the Northampton branch of the Anti-Suffrage Association.

The Advisory Board has been enlarged by the addition of Mrs. Joseph Hoppkin, and Miss Eleanor Huse, who is League Secretary, (Bryn Mawr); Mrs. Robert N. Turner (Radcliffe); Miss Kate J. Knott (University of Michigan); and Miss Jean L. Kendall (Mt. Holyoke). There are now over 300 members of the League; among them such well-known women as Miss Ethel Hale Freeman of the Smith Faculty; Mrs. Lee S. McCollister, President of the Boston Smith Club, and President of the Boston Branch of the Association of College Alumnæ; Miss Agnes Rothery (Agnes Edwards) of the Youths' Companion; Mrs. C. F. Marble, President of the Worcester Woman's Club, Miss Mary N. Burrage, social worker; Miss Edith N. Buckingham, Ph.D. (Radcliffe); and Miss Winifred Lewis, Assistant Town Clerk of Rochester, Mass.

It is hoped that the Presidents of Anti-Suffrage Associations in other States will take measures to organize College Leagues. The quick response which has been made to the movement in Massachusetts encourages the hope of like success elsewhere. Wherever there are State Anti-Suffrage Associations there should be College Leagues, so that the undergraduates of all women's colleges may have an opportunity to hear the constructive arguments on which anti-suffrage rests.

Graduates of women's colleges, and those who have spent one or more years in college, are invited to join the League. They should send their names to Miss Eleanor Huse, Secretary, 879 Beacon St., Brookline.

SUFFRAGE BY STEALTH

IT appears that the attempts which were made in Boston and elsewhere by women formerly resident in suffrage states to induce the registration officials to register them as voters in Massachusetts were not inspired by personal caprice; but were a part of a deliberately-planned scheme to make what The Woman's Journal describes as "test cases."

The women engaged in this enterprise carried with them copies of the Federal Constitution, and pointed the registration officials to the following sections:

"No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States."

"One State shall give full faith and credit to the acts of another State."

It does not appear that any registration officials took this claim seriously. If the suffragists who concocted this scheme had pursued their Constitutional researches further, they would have found that the Constitution expressly recognizes the right of the several States to establish the qualifications for suffrage; that it provides that Representatives, Senators and Presidential Electors "in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State Legislature"; and that Article Fourteen of the Amendments, from which the suffragists took their first quotation, itself reads:

"When the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors of President and Vice-President of the United States, etc., is denied *to any of the male members* of such State, being of twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, etc."

It would be a waste of space to treat seriously the absurd claim of the suffragists that the right to vote in a suffrage state gives them the right to vote in male-suffrage states, if they choose to shift their residence. But it may be briefly remarked that, if this claim were conceded we should have women voting in all the male-suffrage states, over-riding the expressed will of the voters refusing them the ballot. Also, that the carrying out of this principle would allow voters from states where election qualifications are the most lax, to vote in other states where the requirements are more strict, so that an alien from Kansas who had only declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States might vote in Massachusetts and other states which require full citizenship, or voters from states which impose no educational qualification might vote in Massachusetts, which requires its voters to be able to read and write in English.

It is useless to pursue further the consequences of this absurd movement but that it should be seriously advocated shows to what straits the suffragists are reduced.

DID IT PAY?

Looking back over four smashing defeats at the polls in 1915, and three more defeats in 1916, the suffrage leaders may well ask themselves whether the policy of abuse, insult and calumny which they have followed in all these campaigns has been justified by the results.

The men in all these States, as in the other States, may be assumed to want whatever is best for the women. If they had believed that the majority of the women wanted the vote, and that it would be best for them and for the State that they should have it, they would have given it to them. They would have been helped to a conclusion upon these points, and upon the promised uplifting influence of women in politics by noticing the bearing and the arguments of the women who appealed for the suffrage. Ordinary sagacity, if no higher motive, it might be thought, would have led the suffragists to observe the common rules of decorum and fair play. Instead of so doing, they stopped at nothing in the way of disorder and calumny.

In the Iowa campaign, they carried their baseless charges of an alliance between the liquor interests and the anti-suffragists so far that even the Sioux City Journal, itself a suffrage paper, was obliged to warn them that they could not "tar some of the best women of Iowa with the same stick with which they tar brewers and distillers and saloon-keepers and hope to make capital out of it for their cause. It is a square deal which the suffragists demand from the men. Let them accord a square deal to sisters who hold opinions different from theirs." But the warning went unheeded; and, after the campaign was over, The Woman's Journal editorially attributed the suffrage defeat to "the underground machinery of the liquor and vice interests, the corrupt politicians, and 'Big Business' in the bad sense of the term."

In South Dakota, they went further. They published an advertisement in the newspapers of the State, declaring: "The vice interests of the whole country are pouring their money into this State for the purpose of defeating woman suffrage. The women of our State, and all fair-minded men, should rise in their might and smite this monster machine that dares, in its wily way, to use every avenue possible to attempt to prejudice the voters against granting to the women of South Dakota the right of franchise." They singled out for personal calumny Mr. Charles McLean of Iowa, who was assisting the anti-suffragists in their campaign, and published as an unsigned advertisement in the newspapers a libelous statement, reprinted from The Woman's Journal of October 21, in which Mrs. Ruth B. Hipple of Pierre said:

"This man McLean is making people believe that he is not employed by the liquor people. Perhaps he is not. But the fact remains that when he was in Deadwood a short time ago, he divided his time, we are told, between the First National Bank, which is owned by Deadwood's ultra-wet mayor, and the Mansion, her most notorious resort."

This was a fiction out of whole cloth. Mr. McLean is a highly respected citizen of Dubuque, whose character is vouched for in a published statement signed by every bank president of that city, by the pastors of the Methodist, Presbyterian, Congregational and Episcopal churches and the president of the Dubuque Catholic College. He is a total abstainer. He never met the mayor of Deadwood, and had never so much as heard of the "Mansion." Fear of prosecution for libel forced Mrs. Hipple to sign and publish a formal retraction, in which she said:

"In the interest of Justice and Fairness I wish to state that personally I am only casually acquainted with Charles McLean. I have no feeling of enmity or malice toward him, and I personally know nothing derogatory to his private character or morals. Any statements contained in such letter which may have unwittingly been construed as reflecting upon his character or morals are cheerfully retracted."

If Mrs. Hipple's sense of "Justice and Fairness" had been operative a little earlier, it might have saved her from taking the leading part in a highly discreditable performance.

In South Dakota, the suffragists, under the leadership of Mrs. Elsie Benedict of Colorado, organized a systematic interference with anti-suffrage meetings. Where such meetings were announced, Mrs. Benedict at the same hour would make suffrage speeches at the nearest street corner, and then lead a crowd into the hall where the anti-suffragists were holding their meeting, and with a waving of suffrage banners, and much noise and shuffling of feet interrupt the speaker. Sometimes, they tied "votes for women" bands on dogs, and turned them loose to disturb the meetings. At Brookings, Mitchell, Yankton and other places, the suffrage demonstrations were of such a character that, if they had been made by Republicans at a Democratic rally, or by Democrats at a Republican rally, they would certainly have led to rioting and police interference. At Brookings, Mrs. Benedict, when told by the manager of the theatre where the anti-suffrage meeting was being held. that she must leave her banners outside, charged upon him, struck him in the face and called him names, and then ran down the aisle, shrieking questions to the speaker.

Similar suffrage tactics were used by the suffragists in West Virginia. At Beckley, November 2d, where Mrs. O. D. Oliphant of New Jersey, who rendered splendid service in the anti-suffrage campaign, was announced to speak at the court house, the suffragists demanded that the court house be refused to her. When this demand was not complied with, they asked the sheriff to stop the anti-suffrage meeting at nine o'clock and turn the court house over to the suffragists. When this demand also was refused a crowd of suffragists entered the hall where the meeting was in progress, and urged men to interrupt the speaker. One man arose immediately in front of Mrs. Oliphant, and gave notice of a

suffrage meeting, and another carried suffrage signs to the platform and tried to place them there, but was removed by the sheriff. After the meeting, many leading citizens apologized to Mrs. Oliphant on behalf of the town, and said that nothing of the sort had ever happened there before; and over fifty men announced that it had changed their votes. At Welch, the electric light wires to the court house were cut, to prevent the anti-suffrage meeting from being held, but candles were brought in and it was held notwithstanding.

These are only a few incidents out of many that might be cited. But they serve to show the temper and spirit in which these suffrage campaigns have been conducted. Now let the suffragists ask themselves: "Did these campaign tactics pay? Are the votes of men for suffrage likely to be won or lost by such demonstrations?" Even Miss Blackwell has reached the point where she concedes that "Any suffragist who is guilty of rudeness in public hurts the cause." What does she think of such organized demonstrations of violence as those at Brookings, South Dakota and Beckley, West Virginia?

ANTI-SUFFRAGE LUNCHEON

Two hundred members of the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts, from all parts of the state, attended a luncheon at Cook's restaurant, Boston, on the 16th of November. Among the guests were Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard of Rhode Island; Mrs. David Conant of Vermont; Mrs. Daniel A. Markham, Mrs. James Goodwin, Mrs. Lynde Harrison, Mrs. William F. Howe, Mrs. Ansel G. Cook, Mrs. William B. Glover and Mrs. Elizabeth R. Burrell of Connecticut; Mrs. Sidney W. Thaxter, Mrs. Clarence Hale and Miss Emma Virgin of Maine; and Mrs. A. T. Dudley, Mrs. D. J. Shepard, Mrs. Abbott and Mrs. Joseph B. Murdock of New Hampshire. These and other officers of New England Anti-Suffrage Associations attended a conference in the morning, for the consideration of methods of work.

At the luncheon, Mrs. John Balch, President of the Massachusetts Association, presided. Affectionate sympathy for Mrs. James M. Codman, Treasurer of the Association, who recently suffered a severe accident, was expressed by a rising vote.

Miss Marjorie Dorman, who was in the city on her way to address the first meeting in Boston of the College Anti-Suffrage League, and to speak at meetings of the League at Radcliffe and Wellesley, took as the text of her remarks Mrs. Catt's recent statement that it is for women to choose whether they will exert their influence in public affairs directly, or through the doubtful medium of husband and child; and said that to describe husband and child as a doubtful medium is to strike a blow at our ideal of the home and its relation to life and society. It is the married woman, she argued, who is first of all to be considered, because the great majority of women are married.

Mrs. Daniel A. Markham, President of the Connecticut Association, described the rapid growth of the Association in that state. She spoke especially of the constructive side of anti-suffrage work, and of the enthusiasm with which Connecticut women were responding to the idea of conservation; and emphasized the need of a large body of non-partisan opinion in public affairs, and the value of women's influence to that end.

Mrs. Lilian Parker Streeter, prominently identified with work for children and for the feeble-minded in New Hampshire, expressed her belief that woman without the vote is in the best position to secure welfare legislation. Mrs. Henry Preston White gave a piquant account of her experiences in the South Dakota campaign. Mrs. B. F. Norton reported for the Congressional Committee of the Eighth Massachusetts District, and described its interview with the Congressional candidates. Mrs. Thomas Allen outlined the work and gave an encouraging account of the growth of the College Anti-Suffrage League; and Mrs. Edwin Ford spoke of the approaching National Anti-Suffrage Convention at Washington.

SUFFRAGE AND THE VOTERS

DURING the last three years, proposed suffrage amendments to state constitutions have been defeated at the polls in eleven states, at twelve state elections. South Dakota counts twice, because the amendment which was defeated in 1914 was resubmitted and again defeated last November.

The eleven states which have thus, within three years, registered their disapproval of woman suffrage, have an aggregate population of 37,541,477.

The eleven equal-suffrage states have an aggregate population of 8,189,469.

The first group of states contain more than four and a half times as many people as the second group.

The chief aim of the suffrage movement for a Federal amendment is to give the 8,189,469 population of the equal-suffrage states exactly the same power in the final decision as the 37,541,477 in the eleven states which have recently rejected suffrage.

When the suffrage leaders declare that they want to escape the "humiliation" of submitting the suffrage question to the voters, this is what they mean. They want to override the voters and force woman suffrage upon them against their will.

"The Suffragist," the organ of the Congressional Union and the "Woman's Party" declares that "the state-by-state method of obtaining suffrage is *a virtual denial of suffrage.*" Why is it a virtual denial of suffrage? Simply because the voters of the different states, when the question is submitted to them, vote the amendments down. Hence the device to secure "votes for women" without allowing the voters to express their opinion.

And this in the interest of a movement which professes to aim at a larger democracy.

THE NATIONAL CONVENTION

THE first National Anti-Suffrage Convention ever held met at Washington on the 7th and 8th of December. The convention opened at the National Theater on the afternoon of the 7th, and delegations were present from all parts of the country. The walls were decorated with American flags, and banners in the "anti" colors and bearing the names of the different States were hung from the balcony railing. Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, the National President, presided, and made the opening address. Mrs. Dodge declared that the demand for a Federal suffrage amendment expressed the wish of only a small minority of women, and that, after 65 years of effort, the suffrage movement was a failure.

A Message from Cardinal Gibbons

A message from Cardinal Gibbons was read to the convention by Mgr. William T. Russell, the newly-appointed bishop of Charleston. The Cardinal said that, when he deprecated woman suffrage, he was pleading for the dignity and honor of woman, and for the perpetuation of the prerogatives inherent in her sex. Insistence on participation in active political life is calculated, he said, to rob woman of her grace of character, and give her nothing in return but masculine boldness. Women cannot vote intelligently unless they give time to the intelligent study of political questions, and all such time taken from the household will be injurious to future generations without giving the present generation any appreciable benefit in the purifying of the ballot. The Cardinal declared that he regarded "woman's rights" women and the leaders of the new school of female progress as the worst enemies of the sex. He expressed the wish that he might impress on American women the danger of such innovations. If woman, he said, desires the dual empire of public and private life, then, like the fabled dog beholding his image in the water, she will lose both. She will fall from the lofty pedestal where nature and Christianity have placed her, and will fail to grasp the political scepter from the strong hand of her male competitor.

Ex-Senator Root's Protest

Miss Alice Hill Chittenden of New York read a protest against the proposed Federal suffrage amendment, prepared by ex-Senator Elihu Root. Mr. Root declared that such an amendment would be a destruction of the right of self-government. Having failed to secure assent to woman suffrage from such states as South Dakota, West Virginia, Iowa, Ohio, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Massachusetts, the advocates of woman suffrage now seek to compel such states to accept it against their will, and to carry on their local government and select their representatives in the national government in conformity to the opinions of the people of other states. To do this would create a condition of intolerable tyranny, and would make the nation an instrument of that tyranny. This would ultimately destroy the nation. The one exercise of national power over suffrage — to prevent discrimination against the black race — was made and justified only upon the same ground which justified the war and the Emancipation Proclamation, and for the time being destroyed local government in the seceding states. It established no precedent and justifies no attempt to control upon a less terrible and compelling cause.

Women and Preparedness

Major General Wood, who had expected to address the convention, was unable to be present, and his place was taken by Mr. Frederick Huidekoper, vice-president of the National Security League. Mr. Huidekoper declared that the country is now in a graver situation than at any time in its history save when actually at war. Americans must take steps to make themselves strong enough to maintain the national existence. What is needed is a compulsory military service system; and women—whose sons, brothers and husbands will go unprepared against an enemy unless we become a nation thoroughly prepared for war—can do a great deal by seeing that school books which tell the truth about our military history are introduced into our schools.

Red Cross Work

Miss Mabel Boardman, of the Executive Committee of the American Red Cross, thanked the anti-suffragists for the great help they had given the Red Cross work; and Mrs. B. L. Robinson, President of the Massachusetts Public Interests League, described the work of that organization in promoting Red Cross activities.

Why Anti-Suffragists?

Brief addresses on the subject, "Why I Am an Anti-suffragist" were made by the Presidents of five State Associations,—Mrs. N. C. Young of North Dakota, Mrs. Robert Garrett of Maryland, Mrs. J. B. Gilfillan of Minnesota, Mrs. Harry E. Talbott of Ohio, and Mrs. James B. Wells of Texas.

A Banquet

Thursday evening, more than four hundred anti-suffrage leaders and their guests were present at a banquet at Rauscher's. Every seat at the tables was taken, and great enthusiasm greeted the speakers, who included Judge Oscar Leser of Baltimore, who spoke of the difficulties which lie in the way of the suffragists who are trying to force a federal amendment; and a number of participants in recent state campaigns against proposed amendments, who described their personal experiences. Among these were Mr. D. C. Gallaher, whose wife is President of the West Virginia Association; Miss Minnie Bronson, Field Secretary of the National Association; Mrs. M. J. Millard of Burlington, Iowa; Mrs. O. D. Oliphant of Trenton, New Jersey; Mrs. E. Jacobsen of Pierre, South Dakota; Mrs. Edward Pennington of Minneapolis; and Mrs. B. L. Robinson of Boston.

A Men's National Organization

At the session of the convention Friday morning, Mrs. Dodge, who presided, spoke of the recent formation of a men's National anti-suffrage or-

ganization, and said that nothing had developed which was of more importance to the work of the women opposed to suffrage than this spontaneous offer of co-operation.

Reports from the States

Encouraging reports of state anti-suffrage activities were made by the Presidents of twenty-six state associations: Mrs. Benjamin H. Craig, Alabama; Mrs. Daniel A. Markham, Connecticut; Mrs. Henry B. Thompson, Delaware; Miss Caroline Patterson, Georgia; Mrs. M. J. Millard, Iowa; Mrs. John F. A. Merrill, Maine; Mrs. Robert Garrett, Maryland; Mrs. John Balch, Massachusetts; Mrs. Henry F. Lyster, Michigan; Mrs. J. B. Gilfillan, Minnesota; Mrs. Edward P. Peck, Nebraska; Mrs. A. T. Dudley, New Hampshire; Mrs. E. Y. Breese, New Jersey; Miss Alice Hill Chittenden, New York; Mrs. N. C. Young, North Dakota; Mrs. Harry E. Talbott, Ohio; Mrs. Horace Brock, Pennsylvania; Mrs. Rowland C. Hazard, Rhode Island; Mrs. Elias Jacobsen, South Dakota; Mrs. James B. Wells, Texas; Mrs. David Conant, Vermont; Mrs. Francis D. Williams, Virginia; Mrs. D. C. Gallaher, West Virginia; Mrs. C. E. Estabrook, Wisconsin; Mrs. Bradford, Tennessee; and Mrs. C. H. Davis, District of Columbia.

An Association Council

At the final session, an association council was constituted by three delegates appointed from each state; plans were discussed for effective work against the federal amendment; and the following officers were elected: President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge; Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Louis A. Frothingham, Mrs. John B. Heron, Miss Anne MacIlvaine, Mrs. Henry W. Thompson, Mrs. Edward Porter Peck, Mrs. John F. A. Merrill, Mrs. N. C. Young; Recording Secretary, Mrs. William B. Glover; Treasurer, Miss Caroline W. Stewart; Directors for 1916-1919, Presidents of the Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Minnesota, Alabama and Iowa Associations; Directors to be added for term 1917-1920, Presidents of the South Dakota and Texas Associations; Directors to be added for term 1918-1921, Presidents of the West Virginia and Wisconsin Associations.

It would be impossible to exaggerate the importance of this convention or its effect in stimulating and extending anti-suffrage activities. It was the first time that anti-suffrage leaders from all parts of the country had had an opportunity to compare their experiences, and to make arrangements for energetic and systematic co-operation both in state campaigns and in opposing the proposed Federal amendment. Ex-Senator Root's masterly exposition of the unjust and revolutionary character of this proposal will help to arouse public sentiment against it; and it will have no chance with Representatives and Senators in this Congress or any later Congress who really represent their constituents. From this time on, suffrage movements, whatever form they may take, and wherever they may be made, will encounter resolute opposition by co-operating associations of men and women, such as have worked together so effectively in Massachusetts. That the convention produced a very favorable impression upon Congress was clear from the expressions of many Congressmen.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

Under the plan for a Constitutional Convention, which was accepted by Massachusetts voters at the November election, a special state election will be held on the first Tuesday in May for the choice of delegates, and the convention will assemble on the first Wednesday in June.

The method of election is unusual, in that no party designations will be permitted on the ballots. Of the 320 members of the convention, 16 are to be elected at large, and four from each of the 16 Congressional districts. The remaining 240 delegates will represent the 240 representative districts. All that is required to get a name upon the ballot in a representative district is a nomination paper signed by 100 registered voters in the district. For the congressional district delegates 500 signatures are required, and for the delegates at large, 1,200.

Three-fourths of the delegates, therefore, will be chosen on nomination papers bearing only 100 signatures. As the obtaining of signatures is a simple matter, and no party endorsement is necessary, this comes near being a free-to-all contest. And, as there is a possible salary of $750 attached, to say nothing of the political importance of the position, it is reasonably certain that there will be a multitude of candidates in the field, from whom the voters may find it difficult to make the wisest selection.

According to the statute under which the election will be held, the convention is empowered to revise, alter or amend the constitution, and to submit such revision, alterations or amendments as it may agree upon to the people for ratification "in the manner directed by the convention," and, if ratified by a majority of the registered voters, such changes will become the fundamental law.

As to the final outcome, a great deal will depend upon whether the recommendations of the convention are submitted to the voters en bloc or separately. The phrase "in the manner directed by the convention" seems to leave the convention free to adopt either method; but it is contended by some that, under a Supreme Court decision, the recommendations must be submitted en bloc. In that case, voters who approve of some of the changes proposed and disapprove of others will have no chance to exercise discrimination, but must vote for or against the whole instrument. It was this dilemma which led to the rejection of the revised constitution in the state of New York, in 1915, by a majority of more than 500,000.

Every stage in this important matter,—the nomination of delegates, the election of the ablest and most truly representative, the framing of a constitution along wise and broad lines, and the vote upon ratification must be followed with solicitude by all who wish the institutions of this state to rest upon a secure foundation.

EVEN TO THE CROPS

THE latest claim of The Woman's Journal is that the beneficent effects of "votes for women" extend even to the crops.

The Woman's Journal points joyously to "the well-nigh incredible crops of wheat, rye, oats, potatoes, etc.," in Montana; and adds: "The farmers are rolling in prosperity. Montana gave women the ballot in 1914, and since then its progress has been phenomenal."

But it appears further from the Journal's statement that Montana's extraordinary growth has continued "five or six years." Are we then to infer that the "well-nigh incredible crops" of the years 1911-1914 were due to what happened in November, 1914?

Has The Woman's Journal no sense of humor, or does it imagine that its readers have none?

NOTES

SOME idea of the tranquilizing of domestic relations which is likely to follow woman suffrage may be gained from the municipal election at Umatilla, Oregon, on the 6th of December, at which Mrs. E. E. Starcher was elected mayor, having defeated her husband who headed the opposing ticket.

CHICAGO had a taste of the elevating influence of women in politics, on the 19th of October, when a band of Woman's Party women, standing with anti-Wilson banners outside the Auditorium at a Wilson rally, was attacked by Wilson women and their banners torn to shreds. During the melee several women were knocked down and trampled on.

IN ILLINOIS, where the separate tabulation of men's and women's votes makes it possible to note the political alignment of the sexes, it appears that the women divided practically exactly as the men did. In Cook county and throughout the state, there was no appreciable variation. The cost of the election was greatly increased; hundreds of thousands of women went to the polls; and the net result was precisely what it would have been if they had stayed away.

THERE is something almost pathetic in the attempts of the Congressional Union leaders to explain away the defeat of their anti-Wilson crusade in the suffrage States. Here is Miss Alice Paul, for example, saying:

"We feel after this refusal to vote for the man who has blocked national woman suffrage that the passage of the Federal amendment is assured, and that no President or party ever again will dare to ignore the just claims of the women of the nation to their suffrage rights."

And this, when President Wilson carried ten of the twelve states in which women voted, the only two which he failed to carry being the strong Republican states, Illinois and Oregon.

WOULD DOUBLE THE WEAKEST ELEMENT

(Mr. Edward Stanwood in the Boston Herald, Nov. 23, 1916)

My point is a very simple one. I do not think—does any one?—that all men are qualified by knowledge, by judgment, by temperament, by desire for good government, to exercise the right of suffrage. I believe that the proportion of women who are so qualified is smaller than the proportion of men, and that the late election proves it to be the fact—the special failing on the part of the women, and also of many men, having been in temperament. That seems to me the conclusive argument against woman suffrage. It would double the weakest element and adulterate the whole.

A SLUMP IN FEMALE REGISTRATION

(From the Boston Traveler, Dec. 2, 1916)

The registration of male voters for the city election, Dec. 19, is the largest in the history of Boston. The total registration of women shows a falling off since the last city election. Still more interesting is the fact that the largest registration of women voters Boston has ever known was in 1886. Why a shrinkage with all the city's increase in population of the last thirty years? Is it that women are not interested in school affairs, to which their activity as voters is confined? If not, what do they care for?

THE "WOMEN'S SPECIAL"

(Editorial in the Boston Herald, Dec. 15)

All accounts from the West agree that the train-load of eastern women who went out there to argue for Mr. Hughes in the suffrage states contributed mightily to his defeat. Some one has reckoned up that they were three days in Washington and a week in California, both of which Hughes lost; that they were only a few hours in Oregon, which he saved, speaking there only in the city of Portland, which he lost overwhelmingly, the rural districts alone saving the state.

The patronizing attitude of the so-called millionaires of the East who were without the ballot, towards their sisters in the West who had been using it for some time, provoked deep resentment. And in consequence enough of the latter decided to vote for Wilson to turn the scale.

This is the report from the West. We incline to think it correct.

SUFFRAGE DEFEATS LAST YEAR

In the Legislatures

In Georgia, the proposed suffrage amendment was defeated in Committee.

In Kentucky, a motion in favor of the proposed amendment was defeated.

In Louisiana, the Legislature refused to submit the proposed amendment to the people.

In Maryland, the House defeated a bill to submit the proposed amendment, by a vote of 64 to 36.

In New Jersey, a Presidential suffrage bill was adversely reported and the report was accepted.

In Rhode Island, a Presidential suffrage bill was killed in Committee.

In South Carolina, a proposed constitutional amendment was defeated in the House.

In Oklahoma, the proposed amendment was defeated in the Senate.

In Virginia, a proposed suffrage amendment was defeated in the Legislature.

At the Polls

In Iowa, June 5, the proposed suffrage amendment was defeated by a majority of 10,341.

In South Dakota, November 7, the voters rejected the suffrage amendment by a vote of 53,432 to 58,350, a negative majority of 4918.

In West Virginia, November 7, the vote against the suffrage amendment was 161,607, to 63,540 in favor, a negative majority of 98,067.